

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4-6, and 15-35 are pending in this application. Claims 5, 6, 16, and 19-28 stand withdrawn from consideration. New dependent claims 29-35 are herein added. Claims 1, 4, and 15 are herein amended. Applicant submits the claim amendments and additional new claims does not add any new matter, as discussed in further detail below.

The drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). Claims 15 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 4, 13, and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 1, 4, 13-15, 17, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. patent 7,321,353 to Tsuda et al. (herein “Tsuda”) in view of U.S. patent 6,105,045 to Kurabayashi et al. (herein “Kurabayashi”). The above-noted objections and rejections are traversed by the present response as now discussed.

Addressing first the objection to the drawings, the drawings were objected to as not showing the “aggregation circuit” and “selection circuit”. In reply to that objection applicant draws attention to Figures 125 and 83 in the present specification, which are believed to clearly show the “aggregation circuit” and “selection circuit”, and which is further discussed below with respect to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112.

Addressing now the above-noted rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, those rejections are traversed by the present response.

Claim 15 is herein amended to clarify certain language therein, and applicant submits such features are supported by the original specification, see page 75, line 23 to page 76, line 6.

With respect to claim 17, applicant draws attention to Figure 125 and the specification at page 172, line 4 to page 173, line 3. Applicant submits from that disclosure it is evident that the “output switching circuit 1251” supports the claimed “selection switch”, and thus

claim 17 is believed to be clearly supported by the specification, and additionally the features therein are believed to be clearly shown in the drawings.

With respect to claim 1, the language therein noted as unclear is now clarified, and applicant submits the clarified language in claim 1 is supported by the original specification for example at page 306, line 16 to page 307, line 1. From that portion applicant submits it is evident that the “determining the *sum* of video data” corresponds to the claimed “aggregating image data”. The features now recited in claim 1 as currently written are also supported by the original specification for example at page 94, lines 20-24; page 76, lines 2-4; page 77, lines 5-10, and applicant also draws attention to Figures 13, 19, and 24 of the specification showing the claimed method of display.

With respect to claim 4, the language therein is also herein clarified and applicant submits the features therein are supported by the original specification for example at page 306, lines 13-19. Applicant submits it is clear from that disclosure that the disclosed “arithmetic circuit 839” supports the claimed “aggregation circuit”, which is also shown in Figure 83. Applicant submits the features recited in amended claim 4 as currently written are also supported by the specification at page 348, lines 15-26. Thereby, claim 4 as currently written is clearly supported by the specification and the features therein are also clearly shown in the drawings.

With respect to claims 13 and 14, those claims are herein canceled without prejudice and thus the rejections thereto are now obviated.

Addressing now the above-noted prior art rejection of claims 1, 4, 13-15, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Tsuda in view of Kurabayashi, that rejection is traversed by the present response as applicant submits each of amended independent claims 1 and 4 as currently written distinguishes over Tsuda in view of Kurabayashi.

Independent claims 1 and 4 as currently written are directed to a EL display apparatus and method. Independent claim 1 now recites operations of:

displaying a non-display area on the display screen of the EL display apparatus according to the calculated period to turn off the current that flows in the EL element; and  
shifting the non-display area on the display screen.

Independent claim 4 as currently written now recites:

the control circuit controls the start pulse signal so as to display a non-display area on the display screen and shift the non-display area on the display screen.

The above-noted features clarified in each of independent claims 1 and 4 are believed to clearly distinguish over the applied art.

Tsuda is directed to an LCD panel as shown for example in Figure 29, see LCD 202, and Kurabayashi is directed to image processing in the field of Desktop Publishing. Applicant submits neither Tsuda nor Kurabayashi is even directed to an EL display apparatus or its driving method. The LCD panel of Tsuda is not an EL display apparatus. Further, the Desktop Publishing system of Kurabayashi is completely unrelated to such an EL display apparatus.

Further, applicant respectfully submits neither Tsuda nor Kurabayashi disclose or suggest any operation of displaying a non-display area on a display screen of the EL display apparatus (independent claims 1 and 4), according to a calculated period to turn off the current that flows in the EL element (independent claim 1), as based on aggregated image data (independent claim 4), and shifting the non-display area on the display screen (independent claim 1). In that respect applicant submits neither Tsuda nor Kurabayashi even disclose or suggest aggregating image data input to an EL display apparatus.

With respect to that feature of aggregating image data the outstanding rejection appears to cite Kurabayashi at column 6, lines 1-17 and 44-49, but applicant notes such

disclosure in Kurabayashi are not at all directed to the claimed features, and are particularly not directed to aggregated data that would be utilized to calculate a period to turn off a current that flows in an EL element. Tsuda also does not disclose or suggest such features.

In view of the foregoing comments, applicant respectfully submits amended independent claims 1 and 4 as currently written positively recite features neither taught nor suggested by Tsuda in view of Kurabayashi, and thus each of amended independent claims 1 and 4, and thereby the claims dependent therefrom, patentably distinguish over Tsuda in view of Kurabayashi.

As noted above the present response also adds new dependent claims 29-35 for examination, which are believed to even further distinguish over the applied art. Applicant also points out new dependent claim 29 and 32 are supported by the original specification for example at page 77, lines 2-10. Applicant points out new dependent claim 30 is supported by the original specification for example at page 322, lines 5-14. Applicant points out new dependent claim 31 is supported by the original specification for example at page 97, lines 2-13. Applicant points out new dependent claim 33 is supported by the original specification for example at page 369, lines 13-19. Applicant points out new dependent claim 34 is supported by the original specification for example at page 69, lines 7-18. Applicant points out new dependent claim 35 is supported by the original specification for example at page 91, lines 14-20.

As no other issues are pending in this application, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance, and it is hereby respectfully requested that this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Eckhard H. Kuesters  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 28,870

Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

Customer Number  
**22850**

Tel: (703) 413-3000  
Fax: (703) 413 -2220  
(OSMMN 08/07)  
SNS/rac

I:\ATTY\SNS\25s\259686\259686US-AM2.doc